UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/599,451	07/18/2007	Domenico Fanara	06-796	9142	
	7590 06/04/200 BOEHNEN HULBER	EXAMINER			
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			THOMAS, TIMOTHY P		
32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL	60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1614		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/04/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Ар	plication No.	ication No. Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			/599,451	FANARA ET A	FANARA ET AL.			
			aminer	Art Unit				
		TIN	MOTHY P. THOMAS	1614				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur r Reply	nication appears	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence	e address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N Isions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum single to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). munication. tatutory period will app will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUN In no event, however, may oly and will expire SIX (6) Me the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of the ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	nis communication.			
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <i>06 March</i>	2008					
·		2b)⊠ This acti						
<i>'</i> —		<i>′</i> —		atters prosecution as to	the merits is			
٥/١	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims		,,	,				
	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
•	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> are subject to restrict	ion and/or elect	ion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9) 🗌 '	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a)  accepte	d or b)⊡ objected t	o by the Examiner.				
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
				·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2)  Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Ination Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-948)	Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application 				

Application/Control Number: 10/599,451 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Applicant's election of (i) levocetirizine as the active substance; (ii) a mixture of methyl parahydroxybenzoate and propyl parahydroxybenzoate as the preservative; (iii-b) thimerosal is absent; (iv-b) chlorhexidine acetate is absent; (v-b) benzylalcohol is absent; and (vi-b) benzylalkonium chloride is absent in the reply filed on 3/6/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
- 2. The Office action, mailed 2/8/08, is hereby VACATED.
- 3. The amendment to the claims introduces new claims drawn to distinct inventions. In addition to the previous species election requirement with the elections made, the following election of a single invention is also required:
- 4. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-17, drawn to a liquid pharmaceutical composition.

Group II, claim(s) 18-21, drawn to a method of making a liquid pharmaceutical composition.

Group III, claim(s) 22-26, drawn to a method of treating a patient.

Application/Control Number: 10/599,451 Page 3

Art Unit: 1614

5. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking the inventions is a liquid pharmaceutical composition comprising cetirizine, levocetriizine, efletirizine or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt and a preservative present in an amount equivalent to an amount of a parahydroxybenzoate ester between 0 and 1.5 mg/mL. As pointed out in the previous Lack of Unity Action, Walters (WO 29004/004705 A2; IDS 11/20/2006 reference teaches aqueous (liquid) compositions comprising pharmaceutically active substances (abstract); pharmaceutical agents include cetirizine (p. 7, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph; claims 8-9); preservatives such as potassium sorbate and/or sodium benzoate (p. 16, paragraph 7), preservative concentrations include 0.045 g/150 mL (0.3 mg/mL) potassium sorbate and 0.023 g/ 150 mL (0.15 mg/mL) sodium benzoate (both concentrations are well below the equivalent effective concentration of 1.5 mg/mL parahydroxybenzoate esters; p. 20, Example 1). Therefore, since the technical feature linking the inventions has been taught in the prior art, the technical feature does not constitute a "special" technical feature. Accordingly, the inventions are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

6. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

The species remain the same as outlined in the Office Action of 2/8/2008, for which elections have been made.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

7. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

See previous Office Action

The following claim(s) are generic: see previous Office Action.

8. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

see previous Office Action.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/599,451 Page 6

Art Unit: 1614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY P. THOMAS whose telephone number is (571)272-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy P Thomas/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614

/Ardin Marschel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614